DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 980 PS 015 596

AUTHOR Hewes, Dorothy W.
TITLE Compensatory Early Childhood Education: Froebelian Origins and Outcomes.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum; Developmental Psychology; Early Childhood Education; Educational Development; *Educational History; *Educational Practices; *Immigrants; *Kindergarten; *Outcomes of Education; Poverty; Primary Education; Religious Factors
IDENTIFIERS Cultural Adjustment; *Fraebel (Friedrich); Nineteenth Century

ABSTRACT

Froebelian kindergartens, popular in the United States during the late 1800's, were widely accepted as an effective way to assimilate immigrant children and their parents into the mainstream of the nation's culture. This paper focuses on the immigration patterns that led to an emphasis upon the educational system of Froebel, upon the effectiveness of the kindergarten programs, and upon the importance of nineteenth-century charity kindergartens in determining the development of early childhood education and developmental psychology. It is argued that the long-term results of the charity kindergartens were more favorable for the benefactors than for the recipients, but that the curriculum as it was initiated was humanistic, child-centered, and appropriate within the "zeitgeist" of Victorian America. (Author/RH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

# COMPENSATORY EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

# FROEBELIAN ORIGINS AND OUTCOMES

ED264980

Dorothy W. Hewes, Ph.D.

Professor, Child Development

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dorothy W. Hewes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

School of Family Studies and Consumer Sciences

San Diego State University

San Diego, CA 92182-0282

(619) 265-4445 or 5380

PS 015596

COMPENSATORY EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION:

FROEBELIAN ORIGINS AND OUTCOMES

Abstract: Froebelian kindergartens, popular in the United States during the late 1800s, were widely accepted as an effective way to assimilate immigrant children and their parents into the mainstream of the nation's culture. This paper has its focus upon the immigration patterns that led to an emphasis on the educational system of Froebel, upon the effectiveness of the kindergarten programs, and upon the importance of nineteenth century charity kindergartens in determining the development of early childhood education and developmental psychology. It is argued that the long-term results of the charity kindergartens were more favorable for the benefactors than for the recipients, but that the curriculum as it was initiated was humanistic, child-centered, and appropriate within the zeitgeist of Victorian America.

# COMPENSATORY EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION:

# FROEBELIAN ORIGINS AND OUTCOMES

The Statue of Liberty, dedicated in 1886, has awakened renewed interest as a symbol of hope and freedom for immigrants arriving in the United Stated from Europe. During the lengthy series of rededication and centennial celebrations, early childhood educators can also view it as a symbol of the strategies that were developed to help the nation cope with overwhelming numbers of newcomers during the last decades of the nineteenth century. Philanthropic kindergartens based upon the system devised earlier in the century by Prussian philosopher Friedrich Wilhelm Froebel were popularized as just one of the many tactics aimed at saving immigrant children from a life of poverty and at assimilating them and their families into the dominant society. This paper examines the impact of immigration, traces the rise and decline of the Froebelian philanthropic kindergartens, and explores some of the developments that have determined our professional attitudes and achievements.

Immigration patterns during the period between 1870 and the early 1900s were integrally tied to the accomplishments of kindergarten supporters. These patterns occurred not only in the total numbers of immigrants but in the family structures and their religious preferences, occupations, and educational levels. Until mid-century, dominant English-speaking Protestants had enjoyed the pleasant delusion that the United States would forever reflect its British origins. It was primarily men from that heritage who were its ministers, its teachers, and its elected officials.

During the entire 45-year period between 1820 and 1865, only about 5 million immigrants arrived; the total population numbered perhaps 32 million by 1865. Although there was some tension when two distinctly different groups came in large numbers during the 1840s and 50s -- Irish Catholics because of a potato famine and liberal Germans because of their own aborted revolution -- these populations were accommodated in their chosen communities. Although these Irish and Germans maintained their own ethnic identity through educational and religious establishments, they were not seen as a threat to the established systems of the country.

For several years after the Civil War, the immigration rate showed only a slight increase. Then the nation was suddenly in crisis. Between 1880 and 1900, more than 10 million Europeans arrived, double the total recorded for the years 1820 to 1865. The influx is attributed in part to the change from sailing ships to those with steam power, since the new and larger vessels were faster, with cheaper fares. The owners began to recruit steerage passengers to fill the cramped spaces below main decks. At the same time, there was unprecedented poverty in Europe, where the population had increased just when agricultural adjustments and the industrial revolution had caused vast numbers of peasants and unskilled workers to be displaced. These factors resulted in a drastic change of immigration patterns. In the first half of the nineteenth century, 80% of the immigrants were Protestants from north-western Europe, usually with vocational skills and capital. In its final years, increased numbers came from southern and eastern Europe. By 1900 they constituted 80% of the annual total. Many were Catholics and Jews, and many were from impoverished backgrounds, with few skills and minimal literacy.

Pre-Civil War immigrants had usually scattered over the eastern seaboard and the frontier settlements, often with the husband/father or son/brother establishing a home before sending for other family members. From the mid-1870s onward it was more common for entire families to arrive together. They moved into the crowded central cities with others from their place of origin. A report from one of the shipping company agents stationed in Europe indicates the mixed feelings about immigration in 1886, the year the Statue of Liberty was dedicated:

> All kinds are continually going to America, good, bad, and indifferent; and many go, or are sent thither, because they cannot be tolerated at home. I think, however, that on the whole we get industrious, saving people . . . for the formation of a national type of character which shall embrace the good characteristics of the leading peoples of the globe. But there may be material enough at hand already for this purpose. From Silesia, Poland, and Bohemia, very poor stuff is going over, it is said, and these are the fellows who threaten our capitalists and throw dynamite. They are beings who live awful poor at home, and are not the material out of which to make sagacious, law-abiding citizens of a great republic. (U.S. Executive Document, 1887, p. 211)

The presence of immigrant colonies crowded into deteriorating central cities, with their different foods and customs, their transplanted languages and mutual aid societies, was viewed by alarmists as an impending

disaster. Native Americans seldom went into those poor area themselves, but their popular reading materials predicted that crime, disease, sexual immorality and drunkenness would overwhelm the nation if the anarchists and other political dissidents didn't gain control first. Even the falling birth rate for native-born Americans was attributed to the presence of these foreigners, since it was speculated that Anglo-Saxons were deliberately choosing race suicide. A century later, social scientists are still studying the lives of these families. Conzen (1979) reported on the vital support role of ethnic neighborhoods during the assimilation process and Fine (1977) analyzed fictional and autobiographical accounts to show that many ghetto residents looked back in later years upon happy childhoods. Morawska's (1984) descriptive title of "For Bread with Butter" indicated the realistic attitudes of Polish immigrants who felt that they were better off than if they had stayed at home. In contrast, Pleck (1983) reviewed reports of family violence and Kushner (1985) found that the suicide rate for foreign born Americans was three times that for the native born in 1890.

Several overall theories relate to the assimilation problems of immigrant families. The "Chicago school" represented by Mowrer (1934) emerged in the 1920s to emphasize the disorganization of family life patterns under adverse circumstances. Later, "structural functionalism" expounded by Parsons, Bales, and others (1955) was more optimistic with its emphasis upon the abilities of societal units -- including families -- to assure continuity and stability through adaptation to change. Whether we utilize these or other hypotheses about the home life of those children who were the target groups of early kindergarten workers, there can only be a

conclusion that family living conditions were extremely difficult. These were working poor, or at least poor people who wanted to work. Fathers earned low wages and were often unemployed. Mothers got minimal pay for long hours of piecework at home or through outside occupations. Older children contributed to family income, while the younger ones (called "curbstone children" by charity agencies) were often left with no supervision during the day. At the same time, church leaders like Cardinal Gibbons (1890) were still asserting that poverty and class distinctions were "supernaturally ordained and inaccessible to cure." Katz (1983) and others have pointed out that the common attitude toward the poverty stricken members of society was based upon an ideology of dependence, relying upon the myth that pauperism and poverty are the consequences of personal or individual failure rather than the results of structural factors in the labor market or in working class life.

Not all Americans accepted the prevailing outlook. From mid-century, some religious denominations were actively working to refute the concept of predetermined socio-economic levels, with the Boston Unitarians among the most outspoken. To them, and to intellectuals and political liberals, there was wisdom in kindergarten crusader Elizabeth Peabody's 1875 argument that early training constitutes "pound-wisdom, cutting off at the root the crime and poverty which would otherwise rankly vegetate, to the misery of our posterity." They even thought that she might be right, two years later, when she wrote that "Some people say, that, as half the children DIE before they are five years old, public funds devoted to their education would be wasteful. But, perhaps, if children went to kindergarten three hours every day from the time they were three years old, they would not die." (Peabody, 1877)

When Froebel announced his idea for a kindergarten in 1836, he saw it as the second phase of a coordinated lifetime education that would begin at birth and extend throughout life. The curriculum was much like a Piaget model in contemporary preschools. As translated by Murray (1914, p. 212), he defined his schools for children aged about two to seven as institutions "for the cultivation of the life of mankind through fostering the impulse to activity, investigation and construction in the child; an institution for self-instruction, for self-education through play." He tried to organize parent support groups and he instituted training programs for young women to prepare themselves to be "kindergartners" teaching classes similar to parent participation nursery schools of today. Within the next twenty years, kindergartens had spread to major cities of Europe and were patronized by royalty and wealthy families. (See Heinemann, 1893)

Although the kindergarten had been mentioned in American publications, its initial supporter was Henry Barnard, Commissioner of Education for Connecticut and publisher of educational journals. After visiting the 1854 international educational conference in London, he reported that "The system of infant culture . . . was by far the most original, attractive, and philosophical form of infant development the world has yet seen (Barnard, 1890, p. 1). His enthusiasm continued when he became the first federal Commissioner of Education in 1867 and was maintained throughout the century. Despite his efforts, the kindergarten movement started slowly in the United States. The first is attributed to Margaretha Schurz, a German immigrant who opened one in her Watertown, Wisconsin, home in 1855. According to Snyder (1972), she introduced Bostonian Elizabeth Peabody to Froebel's writings in 1859. Peabody is generally credited with doing more to

popularize American kindergartens than any other individual. With her sister Mary, widow of educator Horace Mann, she opened the first English-language kindergarten in 1860. It soon closed, with Civil War activities taking priority, but in 1867 Peabody visited European kindergartens and teacher training schools and in 1870 she and Mary Mann started a philanthropic kindergarten. At that time, there were probably about eight or nine others in the United States, all in German-American schools.

After an initial period of testing, with a disappointing number of kindergartens failing within a few years, a period of rapid expansion took place. Nina Vandewalker, writing a history of the movement in 1908, considered the Period of Introduction to have been from 1855 to 1880. The Period of Reorganization began about 1890. After the first charity kindergartens in 1870, their numbers increased dramatically, with volunteer work almost a fad among wealthy young women by 1880. She estimated that there were about 400 kindergartens in 30 states by that date. By 1984, there were ten times that number. The U.S. Commissioner of Education reported in 1880 that there were 232 kindergartens with 524 teachers and 8,871 children. He noted that a similar survey done in 1873 had listed only 42 classrooms with 73 teachers and 1,252 pupils and he credited charity kindergartens with much of the increase. It is difficult to know exactly how many classes were for children of fee-paying parents and how many were supported by philanthropy for the benefit of poor immigrant families, but they seem to have been about evenly divided. Volunteer mothers often took their own children when they assisted in the charity programs, and many of the children from poverty families seem to have attended classes with established middle-class pupils, further complicating the data.

Members of the New England Women's Club, Sorosis, the Women's Christian Temperance Union and similar associations became involved with kindergartens in the late 1870s. The names of Elizabeth Peabody, Caroline Severance, Julia Sprague, Emma Marwedel and others from the pioneering days of the Froebelian movement are found on the rosters and in the records of women's groups. Peabody, in particular, was dependent upon individual members for funds and recruitment contacts. Conversely, the clubs often used kindergartens as a focus point for their own philanthropic efforts, at either the local or the national levels, or both. The WCTU, for example, adopted the slogan of "Prevention, not Reform -- the Kindergarten Not the Prison is True Philanthropy" and its local affiliates sponsored kindergartens in cities across the nation as part of a campaign for public schools to adopt preprimary education.

Many of the clubwomen were wealthy matrons, generous with their own money and that of their husbands. One of the fourteen millionaires supporting the Golden Gate (San Francisco) kindergartens, Jane Stanford, gave more than $30,000 by 1887 and in 1890 made a permanent endowment of $100,000. On the east coast, Pauline Agassiz Shaw began supporting Elizabeth Peabody's first kindergarten sometime around 1877 and five years later was using some of the profits from her husband's copper mining interests to underwrite 31 more in the Boston area. Even though she spent at least $200,000 annually for at least a decade, she was adverse to using the designation of "charity" because it implied a demeaning status for the recipients. Other women from the highest social realms expressed similar feelings which indicate their basic sisterhood. Names like Armour, Vanderbilt, and Hearst supported the kindergartens, representing not just

money but time. They also provided energy, leadership and influence and they set a precedent for middle-class and poorer women to follow. In contrast to the vast sums contributed by the women of wealth, some association members pledged fifty cents a month, saved penny by penny from household allowances or earned through selling baked goods and handicrafts. Working within the spirit of sisterhood, women of all social classes, religious denominations, and political orientations worked together to promote and maintain both philanthropic and fee-paid kindergartens. Many associations sponsored classes that combined children of all social levels, incorporating varied ethnic groups with the understanding that in the eyes of God and Froebel all mothers and children were of value. At the height of the kindergarten crusade, Amalie Hofer editorialized,

> There are seventy-five thoroughly organized kindergarten associations . . . (They) comprise prominent citizens who lend their influence and money to the movement . . . teachers who meet under the Froebel banner for self-education . . . groups of earnest parents who are aiming to create public interest in this vital work of child training. These working centers form a network from city to city across our continent. The self-appointed stewards of the new education are a thoroughly organized force, six thousand strong, pledged to a modern reformation. The(y) . . . form a ganglia of vitalizing centers throughout our country and constitute what we name the kindergarten movement. These centers, each of which is illumined by the dedicated lives of strong, earnest, aggressive women, push their energies in many directions. (Vandewalker, p. 74)

The dynamic increase in kindergarten numbers is related to their success with poor immigrant children and to the enthusiasm of volunteers who supported them. Ross (1976) captured the messianic fervor in her aptly titled account of The Kindergarten Crusade. Shapiro (1983) credited the social teachings of Evangelical Protestantism for much of the success in this child saving campaign.

Across the nation, charity kindergarten advocates soon realized that the most effective way to gain support was through demonstrating the change in children from "dirty hoodlums" to clean students happily involved with a Froebelian curriculum. In Louisville, for example, as many as 3,000 people a year visited the charity kindergartens directed by Patty Smith Hill. In San Francisco, between 17 and 18 hundred visitors were recorded between June 1879 and June 1880, including reporters from almost every newspaper in the state and correspondents from eastern and foreign papers. Their kindergarten society reported in 1881 that

> Public opinion, where before it has been ignorant or incredulous, suddenly developed an enthusiasm which has not cooled, and the subject today, it is safe to say, is talked over in every class of society, in every corner of the city. (p. 1)

The Froebelian kindergartens, developed for German children and often misinterpreted by American enthusiasts, were modified as they moved into improvised quarters in slum environments. It was impossible to carry out the traditional play program. Attempts were made to have green growing plants in pots, attractive and clean interiors, and some personal

space for each child's private possessions. Trained teachers, with the assistance of volunteers, not only tried to follow a Froebelian curriculum but also washed, clothed, and fed their young charges. The age range might include infants brought by babysitting sisters and older children who preferred the kindergarten atmosphere to primary classrooms. Attendance was sporadic, perhaps with a core group of a dozen and a floating enrollment of sixty or seventy who came irregularly. Teachers who had been taught to consider the individual needs of each child were faced with those whose names and ages were unknown, often speaking a variety of home languages. Accounts written by kindergarten workers include vivid descriptions of angry children who "made the air blue with vile oaths" or were so "tipsy" that they were simply bedded down in a back room. But after the midday meal, children were dismissed and their teachers went visiting in the neighborhood to help with family problems, teach the essentials of what we now call child development, and Americanize the immigrants. While their achievements were by no means as tremendous as some sentimental claims would indicate, these women seem to have been widely accepted and to have achieved modest success.

However, as the numbers of immigrants increased and public concern was expressed in demands that something drastic be done to save society, the independent charity kindergartens began to merge with public schools and to become identified with social settlements. The Frobelian philosophy was best maintained in the settlements, with Jane Addams of Chicago's Hull House declaring that Froebel would be distinctly disappointed if he were to come back to earth and find his followers so much involved with young children and not with learning at all ages. Hull House had a kindergarten from the time it opened in 1889, first in the drawing room and then as part of the

beautifully designed Children's Building that was erected in 1896. By the mid-1890s, all major cities in the nation had settlement houses, some of them expansions of kindergartens and others with kindergarten classes included among the first of their many programs. Their resident staff lived as a family in the neighborhood of their clients and their services were an expansion upon the friendly visiting of kindergarten teachers and volunteers. In almost all cases, the kindergarten teacher and student interns from training programs lived in outlying areas, with no responsibilities beyond teaching young children and conducting occasional parent meetings.

Froebel's ideas did not transplant so successfully into the public school systems. Efforts of kindergarten associations and civic groups to get preprimary level education into elementary schools had begun in the early 1870s. Onset of the 1893-97 major depression caused a sharp decline in philanthropic assistance just as the demand for kindergarten classes intensified. Simultaneously, the rise of nationalism led to a new emphasis upon education, as early as possible, to instill patriotic ideas and the morality necessary for law-abiding citizens. School officials reluctantly accepted kindergartens as an inevitable part of their systems, although in many states it was first necessary to pass legislation to lower the entrance age and/or gain access to tax funding. Kindergarten support groups spearheaded the campaign, usually pledging some financial assistance if the schools provided rooms and teachers. From perhaps twelve to fifteen thousand children attending public school kindergartens in 1886, there was an increase to almost 132 thousand by 1900. In some communities, most of the classes were located in middle class neighborhoods. In others, a social

quarantine policy isolated poor immigrant children in kindergartens where they could be taught English, channeled into appropriate behavior, and prepared for their few years of elementary school.

Despite retention of the kindergarten name, many of the public school classes bore little resemblance to the original play garden concept. Although there were notable exceptions, a majority of them were operated as cheaply as possible, with large enrollments, improvised facilities, and teachers who were overworked and underqualified. Lazerson (1971) has traced the deterioration from model philanthropies to public school subprimary classes. Kindergarten teachers continued to use Froebel's books for texts and inspiration, but they were no longer able to provide the informality and fun that had characterized the better charity programs. As one turn-of-the-century teacher retorted, when asked about her Froebelian philosophy, "Philosophy? We had seventy children in one room, and the toilets were in back of the store next door. Who had time for philosophy?" (Jenkins, 1974).

## Conclusions

Because a century has passed since the height of the philanthropic Froebelian kindergarten crusade, it is difficult to evaluate its precise accomplishments in the assimilation of immigrant families during the late 1800s. We do have contemporaneous studies, however, and there are many recent publications that report on comparable populations. Conclusions can be drawn about the results of kindergarten work for the children involved, its effects on their parents, its value for the women who organized and supported local and national support systems, and the influence of Froebelian philosophy upon organizations and policies after 1900.

Evaluation of the charity kindergartens as they were operated by associations of women, with a trained staff using modified Froebelian materials, indicates that they provided a valuable preschool education for those children who were enrolled. In smaller cities like Louisville and Detroit and San Francisco, the enrollments represented a significant number of eligible children. Psychologist G. Stanley Hall (1911, p. 16) considered himself "a true disciple of Froebel" and asserted that his "orthodoxy" was the "real doxy which Froebel would approve." Hall (1883) pronounced Boston's charity kindergarten students superior "in the contents of their minds" to those from wealthy families. Similar favorable reports were made by John Dewey (1896), who appreciated the spontaneous activity of kindergarten classes when he gathered data on social interaction.

Discounting the mystical qualities that were sometimes attributed to them, Froebel's sequenced Gifts and Occupations provided materials similar to didactic apparatus now used in Montessori preschools. They also resembled equipment commonly used today in occupational placement tests to measure manual dexterity and spatial relationships. Their relevance for vocational education was recognized early in the kindergarten crusade. For example, Thomas Hunter, president of New York Normal College wrote in 1880 that

> The question naturally arises, what is the effect of the kindergarten instruction on the children when they reach the higher grades of school. The effect has been tested by comparing them with children who have not had the benefits of the Kindergarten;

> we have invariably found that the children trained in the Kindergarten are brighter, quicker, and more intelligent. . . One great benefit . . . is that the principles and practice of the Kindergarten unconsciously create and foster a taste for mechanical trades. (Barnard, p. 535)

Kindergartens, and the manual arts classes for upper grades that were an outgrowth of the Froebelian movement, helped prepare immigrant children for jobs with economic stability and upward mobility on the assembly lines of American industry. Vandewalker (1908, pp. 112-124) stated that the value of such training was appreciated by major employers. For example, she described the National Cash Register Company's model program in Dayton, where the president believed that "the difficulties of the past in obtaining workmen with bright ideas may be overcome by training children of the present" and required that after 1915 no workers without kindergarten background were to be hired. Of the thousands of children who went through the kindergartens, there are scattered references to those who entered as "street Arabs" or "three-year-old ruffians" and years later were lawyers or business men who made donations to their old schools, but the primary hope seems to have been more modest.

If recent compensatory preschools are compared with those of a hundred years ago, their goals and accomplishments appear to be similar. High quality programs have both short- and long-term benefits to children and their families. Head Start has served more than 9 million children since 1965 and careful research has demonstrated its cost effectiveness (Brown, 1985). Similarly, other intervention programs have proven their

value. By age 19, Perry Preschool graduates showed more positive attitudes toward education, higher ratings on an adult test of functional competence, and better economic status than a control group that did not attend preschool. Economic benefits are estimated to be seven times the cost of a year's preschool (Berrueta-Clement, Schweinhart, et al, 1984). The key term is "high quality program," and the better Froebelian kindergartens of the 1880s would be considered excellent if they were evaluated on the basis of an instrument such as the 1985 accreditation criteria of the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Then, as now, the impact of compensatory education was limited because the classes could accommodate only a fraction of the eligible children and because graduates moved on into elementary grades that failed to provide for their special needs.

Similarly, the effect upon mothers and other family members was potentially positive but was limited in scope and totally inadequate for the problems confronting immigrants in the urban slums. The parent education component of today's compensatory preschools has proven its value. For example, Stevens (1984), in a typical evaluation study, reported that parents given systematic education about child development received higher scores on home quality learning environments. Grubb and Lazerson (1982, p. 229) although highly critical of most parent education programs, approved of those that

> provide a forum for parents to share their experiences and to be comforted about their inevitable fears. . . . In this process professionals can be by turns reassuring, informative, and challenging, though the success of such groups requires professionals who are

comfortable as partners with parents rather than didactic and paternalistic superiors.

Their model, which agrees with most current theories in the field, accurately describes the sisterly friendly visiting, parent participation, and other support of the charity kindergartens. Further, the entire field of social support services is currently a popular research topic, with Shumaker and Brownell (1984) defining it as an exchange of resources between two individuals perceived by the provider or recipient to be intended to enhance the well-being of the recipient." Among the complex variables they consider important, such as congruence between the perceptions of the participants, Froebelian kindergarten workers would get high rankings. For instance, recent studies of relocation syndrome and immigration trauma focus on such symptoms as irritability, a feeling of depression, criticism of the new environment with idealization of the old one, and a sense of isolation -- characteristics that were recognized by the kindergarten workers. In the 1880s, their response was to provide social events, to educate through a sort of orientation program, and to offer themselves as friends and helpers.

Although there appear to have been benefits to children and mothers, the charity kindergartens must also be viewed as educational programs for the women who organized and supported them. Froebel believed that education came through self-activity, that self-esteem and self-realization were the outcomes of true learning. The autonomy women found through working in their communities and in national networks gave them a chance to learn about social and economic realities and to develop skills in areas previously unknown to them. It must be emphasized that these were not

militant feminists. Even into the 1900s, most used traditional feminine tactics to accomplish their goals, but they and their daughters competently moved into reform movements in education, juvenile justice, consumer protection, child labor, prostitution, and other aspects of public policy previously unknown to them. Their actions have been criticized, as when Platt (1977) wrote that child-saving impetus came primarily from the middle and upper classes who were instrumental in devising new forms of social control to protect their power and privilege." These kindergarten leaders, however, were primarily the wives and daughters of those Anglo-Saxon men who had been attempting to maintain the New England ideal for the nation's economic, political, and cultural life. As I have gained familiarity with their work, I have become convinced that they were not trying to maintain the old established system but were trying to change it from within. Their sisterhood with the mothers of the slums led them to reject the popular ideas about poverty as an inherited condition or as one that the poor families preferred. They questioned the old idea that God gave wealth to some individuals so that they could wisely spend it to benefit everybody. The depression of 1893 was particularly devastating and they recognized the problems of poor families. Feminist historian Elise Boulding (1976, p. xxii) wrote that "Women have for millennia had to work for the public good from privatized places." For American women, the charity kindergarten provided an opportunity to move out of privatized places into those of the public domain.

The overlap between kindergarten workers and clubwomen, church organizations, temperance and women's suffrage activists blurs areas of influence, but it is possible to trace the routes of better-known women and

their daughters as they moved on into reform movements early in the twentieth century. To give but one example, the development of municipal reform in New York City included a carefully selected group of "society women" who met in December, 1894, and a year later were the Public Education Association. In his history of public school reform, Sol Cohen (1964, p. 2) wrote that all had been active in philanthropic and church work. "Mrs. William S. Rainsford, the PEA's first president, was the wife of the famous rector of St. George's Episcopal Church and was active in the kindergarten branch. . . Mrs. Edward R. Hewitt . . . was active in the New York Kindergarten Association and other charities." Although they usually do not identify their Froebelian backgrounds so clearly, histories of other major childsaving and reform associations during the progressive period are scattered with the names of women involved in the charity kindergartens.

Activities of Froebelians within their churches and other community organizations helped spread the ideas of joyful education and self-discipline, with changes in elementary schools attributed to kindergarten influence. Vandewalker (1908, p. 247) devotes two chapters of her 1908 kindergarten history to the public schools and their "growing comprehension of a fundamental truth proclaimed by Froebel and sanctioned by modern psychology, -- that both the matter and the method employed in the different grades must originate in the children's present needs and interests instead of in the interests and needs of the future." She describes the recognition of art instruction, manual training, games, nature work, and other previously ignored areas. Vandewalker (1908, p. 209) believed that the kindergarten, both private and philanthropic, had by that time been "one of the vital influences in American education," forming "a happy memory in

the lives of the three million or more children who have participated" and interpreting life from a higher standpoint to the twenty-five thousand or more young women who have taken courses in kindergarten training." Kate Douglas Wiggin (1925, p. 46), who had opened California's first charity kindergarten west of the Rockies in 1878, updated Vandewalker's evaluation of Froebel in the public schools with characteristic optimism when she wrote

> The development of the kindergarten to its present status and dignity in the educational world has been a great satisfaction to those who labored faithfully in the field through stormy years, lean years, and years when "The Enemy came and sowed tares." The tremendous faith of those early kindergartners has been justified; the salient principles of Froebel are the principles of the great educators of today. True, adjustments in method have been made, and details discarded in the light of continued child study. But throughout the entire school system at the present time we see awakened interest in the child's nature, respect for his rights, and joy in teaching as a direct outgrowth of the old admonition, "Come, let us live with our children."

Because there is a clear "paper trail" to their origins, it is easier to document the role of Froebelians in the overlapping disciplines of early childhood education, developmental psychology, and child development. Of the many contributors to those overlapping disciplines, Patty Smith Hill

and G. Stanley Hall are outstanding. Hill was trained in the European-based kindergarten methods in 1877-79. In 1895, she worked with G. Stanley Hall and other Froebelians on what she later called "an ideal scheme of education for child welfare in early life . . . far in advance of any immediate possibility of realization." (Hill, 1942) From the summer of 1905, she was on the faculty of Teachers College, Columbia University. In the 1920s, as a leader of the kindergarten educators, she consciously manipulated the formation of American nursery schools. The 1895 proposal became the foundation for the child development curriculum in colleges and for today's private and public preschools. Hewes (1976) traced the Froebelian orientation of Hill's influence on the National Committee on Nursery Schools, now the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Head Start and similar compensatory early childhood education developed from the charity kindergartens, and a Froebelian perspective is dominant in American Child Care program standards.

G. Stanley Hall, the founder of child psychology, became president of Clark University in 1889 and made it a major center for research and writing in child study. He not only influenced progressive education but was a major factor in the improvement of public school conditions early in the 1900s. Among his students were both educators and psychologists. Among them was Arnold Gesell, who opened the Yale Clinic for Child Development in 1911 and began preaching Froebel's maturational theories in the language and with the power of modern psychology.

Hill, Hall, Gesell, and others who followed the developmental orientation first popularized through the Froebelian charity kindergartens have failed to gain recognition commensurate with their influence. A clue

to attitudes about young children is found in the final chapter of Milton Senn's 1975 monograph that traced the history of child development from the 1920s into the 1970s. First of all, the people he interviewed were not sure that there is something called a child development movement. Then, after summarizing a variety of attitudes regarding funding and methodologies, Senn quoted Sibylle Escalona reflecting that

> There is a funny, social, historical phenomenon that has been noted, I guess, ever since the eighteenth century which is that all those who focused their effort on children in the intellectual hierarchy tend to drop a little lower than the people who work with adults. It's a very peculiar circumstance, but it is so, and to this day high school teachers are on a higher status than a kindergarten teacher; within psychiatry, child psychiatrists are a little bit lower than adult psychiatrists. And those are the things that I think are way beyond the realm of logical, rational characteristics of activity and just part of the social scene in which we live. (pp. 88-89)

In Senn's monograph, as in the majority of historical accounts that would logically be expected to include references to the Froebelians, the kindergarten influence is omitted. I have concluded that the charity kindergarten crusade has left us with a dual heritage. On the one hand, if there had not been tremendous concern for the fate of the nation under the onslaught of immigrant families and an effort to provide compensatory early childhood education through charity associations, it is likely that Froebelian ideas would not have become popular. On the other hand, the

identification of aff work with young children as being comparable with the philanthropic efforts of Victorian women remains a major handicap in public policy advocacy and in the advancement of child development and related disciplines. Resolution of this situation can perhaps come with the passage of time, a re-definition of masculine-feminine roles, and the growing need for child care that is increasingly felt by middle-class families.

Reference Notes

Portions of this paper were presented at the International Standing Working Group for the History of Early Childhood Education, University of Bamberg, FRG, August 30, 1984.

Location of primary sources included the Archives for the Association for Childhood Education International, now Wheaton, MD, but then located in Washington, D.C., the Kindergarten Memorial Library of the Los Angeles County schools, the Hailmann Collection and others at the University of California in Los Angeles, and the Archives of the Froebel Institute College in London.

In addition, the following were the most valuable publications used:

The Kindergarten Messenger, 1873-1877

The New Education, 1876-1893

Kindergarten News, 1890-1897

Reports of the San Francisco Public Kindergarten Society, 1878-1906

Reports of the Golden Gate Kindergarten Association, 1880-1910

National Conference of Charities and Correction, Proceedings of Annual Meetings, 1880-1900

Proceedings of National Froebel Association, 1882 & 1884

Report of the Froebel Institute of North America, 1884

Annual Reports of National Educational Association, 1875-1906

Information about immigration came from various reports of the Department of the Interior Census Office, Unemployment and the International Migrations of Workers in Report to the International Committee of the International Association of Unemployment, Jena, Germany (1913), the Reports of Consular Offices of the United States (1887) cited below, and materials distributed in 1985 by the Statue of Liberty - Ellis Island Foundation, New York.

References

Barnard, B. (Ed.) (1890 reprint of 1879). Kindergarten and child culture papers. Hartford: American Journal of Education.

Burrueta-Clement, Schweinhart, L.J., et al (1984). Changed lives: The effects of the Perry Preschool Program on youths through age 19. Ypsilanti: High/Scope.

Boulding, E. (1976). The underside of history: A view of women through time. Boulder: Westview Press.

Brown, B. (1985). Head Start: How research changed public policy. Young Children, 40, 9-13.

Conzen, K.N. (1979). Immigrants, immigrant neighborhoods, and ethnic identity: Historical issues. Journal of American History, 66, 606-615.

Cohen, S. (1964). Progressives and urban school reform. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dewey, J. (1896). A pedagogical experiment. Kindergarten Magazine 8, 6-7.

Fine, D.M. (1977). The city, the immigrant, and American fiction, 1880-1920. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press.

Gibbons, G. (1890). Untitled report. Proceedings, Annual Meeting, National Conference of Charities and Correction. Boston: George Elles.

Grubb, W.N. & Lazerson, M. (1982). Broken promises. New York: Basic.

Hailmann, W.N. (Ed. & Trans.) (1887). Froebel's education of man. New York: Appleton.

Hall, G.S. (1883). The contents of children's minds. Princeton Review, 11, 249-272.

Hall, G.S. (1911). Educational Problems (Vol. 1). New York: Appleton.

Heinemann, A.H. (Ed.) (1893). Froebel letters. Boston: Lothrop, Lee, & Shepard.

Hewes, D.W. (1976). Patty Smith Hill: Pioneer for young children. Young Children, 31, 297-306.

Hill, P.S. (1942). Kindergarten. American Educator Encyclopedia, 1948-1973.

Jenkins, A.I. (1974). Audiotaped interview by D.W. Hewes. Pasadena.

Katz, M.B. (1983). Poverty and Policy in American History. Monograph Studies in Social Discontinuity.

Kushner, H.I. (1985). Immigrant suicide in the United States: Toward a psycho-social history. Journal of Social History, 18, 3-24.

Lazerson, M. (1971). Origins of the urban school: Public education in Massachusetts, 1870-1915. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Morawska, E. (1984). For bread with butter: Life-worlds of peasant immigrants from East Central Europe, 1880-1914. Journal of Social History, 17, 387-404.

Mowrer, E. (1934). The family, its organization and disorganization. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Murray, E.R. (1914). Froebel as a pioneer in modern psychology. Baltimore: Warwick & York.

National Association for the Education of Young Children (1985). Accreditation Criteria and Procedures of the National Academy of early childhood programs. Washington, D.C.: NAEYC.

Parsons, T., Bales, R.F., et al (1955). Family, socialization, and interaction process. New York: Free Press.

Peabody, E. (1875). Untitled editorial. Kindergarten Messenger, 3.

Peabody, E. (1877). Untitled editorial. Kindergarten Messenger, 1 (new series).

Platt, A.N. (1977). The child savers: The invention of delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pleck, E.H. (1983). Challenges to traditional authority in immigrant families. In M. Gordon (Ed.), The American Family in Social-Historical Perspective (pp. 504-517). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Ross, E.D. (1976). The kindergarten crusade: The establishment of preschool education in the United States. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.

San Francisco Public Kindergarten Society (1882). Report of the Society for the three years ending September 1, 1881. San Francisco.

Senn, M.J. (1975). Insights on the child development movement in the United States. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development. No. 161.

Shapiro, M. (1983). Child's Garden - The kindergarten movement from Froebel to Dewey. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Shumaker, S.A. & Brownell, A. (1940). Social support: An introduction to a complex phenomenon. Journal of Social Issues, 40, 1-16.

Snyder, A. (1972). Dauntless Women in Childhood Education, 1856-1931. Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International.

Stevens, J.H. (1984). Child development knowledge and parenting skills. Family Relations, 33, 237-244.

United States Commissioner of Education, Bureau of Education (1880). Report on Public and Private Kindergartens. Washington, D.C.: Gov't Printing Office.

United States Executive Document no. 157, Emigration and Immigration, reports of the Consular Offices of the United States. Washington, D.C.: Gov't Printing Office.

Vandewalker, N. (1908). The kindergarten in American education. New York: Macmillan.

Wiggin, K.D. (1923). The girl and the kindergarten. New York: Houghton Mifflin.